

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/808,894	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Khanh Dang	2181

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Khanh Dang. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Treitler (Atty. of Record). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 October 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Skarda et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO 1226
CONNECTION TEL 912125880500
SUBADDRESS
CONNECTION ID
ST. TIME 10/21 12:27
USAGE T 00'45
PGS. 2
RESULT OK

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/808,894	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Khanh Dang	2181	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Khanh Dang. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Treitler (Atty. of Record). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 October 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Skarda et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Treitler argued that Skarda et al. does not disclose a "control means for controlling power supply to said antenna device" (a proposed amendment to claim 1). The Examiner will review the Skarda et al. rejection. If Skarda et al. indeed does not explicitly or inherently disclose a control means for controlling the power supply to the antenna, and if such proposed amendment has support from the originally filed specification, the Skarda et al. rejection will be withdrawn..